

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-6758

ANTHONY GRANDISON; STEVEN H. OKEN; JOHN BOOTH-
EL; WESLEY EUGENE BAKER, et al., Plaintiffs,
Prisoners of the Maryland Correctional Adjust-
ment Center, under a sentence of death, on
behalf of themselves and all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President, United States of America; JANET
RENO, Attorney General of the United States of
America; LYNNE ANN BATTAGLIA, United States
Attorney for Maryland; EUGENE M. NUTH, Warden,
Maryland Correctional Adjustment Center, et
al., Defendants, sued in their official
capacities,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Frederic N. Smalkin, District Judge. (CA-
97-1396-S)

Submitted: June 30, 1998

Decided: August 7, 1998

Before MURNAGHAN, WILKINS, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Grandison, Steven H. Oken, John Booth-El, Wesley Eugene Baker, Appellants Pro Se. Lynne Ann Battaglia, United States Attorney, Andrea L. Smith, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellants, Maryland inmates under death sentences, appeal the district court's order dismissing this action seeking a declaratory judgment and injunctive relief and challenging the constitutionality of Chapter 154 of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-132, 110 Stat. 1214. Each Appellant has, or will have, pending in the district court a 28 U.S.C.A. § 2254 (West 1994 & Supp. 1998) petition. Their respective entitlement to habeas corpus relief is the underlying case or controversy. A judgment in the subject action "would not resolve the entire case or controversy as to any one of them, but would merely determine a collateral legal issue governing certain aspects of their pending or future suits." Calderon v. Ashmus, 118 S.Ct. 1694, 1699 (1998). The Supreme Court in Calderon ruled that such an action is not a justiciable case under U.S. Const. art III. See id. at 1698-99.

We accordingly grant in forma pauperis status and affirm. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED